UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,251	01/21/2004	Kia Silverbrook	WAL11US	3252

24011 7590 12/05/2005

SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, NSW 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, ANTHONY H	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2854	

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/760,251	SILVERBROOK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anthony H. Nguyen	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15, 17, 18 and 21-49* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *16,19 and 20* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 30, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3, 6-10, 12, 17, 21-33, 37, 38-45, 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Martin (US 2002/0171692 A1) in view of Sharma et al.(US 6,527,357) and Schoendienst et al. (US 5,302037)..

With respect to claim 1, Martin teaches a printer 18 for producing rolls of wallpaper having a frame (no numeral reference), a print head 20 located across the media path, an input devices 36, 37, a processor 38 and a winding area 26, 28. Martin does not teach the use of a pagewidth inkjet printhead and the winding area which

retains a tote for a roll of wallpager. Sharma et al. teaches the use of a pagewidth inkjet printhead 1 as shown in Fig.7 of Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. teaches pivot mount door or the winding area 50 which removably retains the roll (TR) (Schoendienst et al., Figs.1c, 5a and 5b). Note that the use of a disposable container with a disposable core is well known in the art. In view of the teachings of Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printer of Martin by providing the pagewidth printhead as taught by Sharma et al. and the winding area which retains a roll of paper as taught by Schoendienst et al. for eliminating the moving parts in the printhead mechanism and ease of removing a roll of wallpaper from a winding area.

With respect to claims 3, Martin and Sharma et al. teach all that is claimed, except the cutting mechanism located between the printhead and the winding area for cutting the printed web from a wound portion. Schoendienst et al. teaches the cutting mechanism 64 located between the print head (PH) and the winding area 50 as shown in Fig.5a of Schoendienst et al. In view of the teaching of Schoendienst et al. , it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printer of Martin and Sharma et al. by providing the cutter as taught by Schoendienst et al. to facilitate maintenance operation of the cutter.

With respect to claim 6, Schoendienst et al. teaches the well or the space between the door 50 and the frame 30 and adjacent to an exit slot 65 (Schoendienst et al., Figs.1-1b).

With respect to claim 8, Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. teach all that is claimed, except for the video display which is a touch screen. However, the use of a touch screen for selection the items shown on the video display is conventional. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a conventional touch screen in Martin for ease of entering data into a printer.

With respect to claims 9 and 10, Schoendienst et al. teaches the use of the loading area for store the media supply rollers (SR) and the take-up roler (TR) and cutting mechanism 64 as shown in Fig.5a of Schoendienst et al.

With respect to claims 21-30, the selection of a desired rate at which the print head prints on a medium or the selection of the number of nozzles or number of ink drops for each of the print head would be obvious through routine experimentation in order to get best possible print quality.

With respect to claims 38-43 and 49, the combination of Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. renders obvious the broad steps of utilizing an on-demand printer, using one or more input devices, using the processor to control the printer and printing a roll of wallpaper according to a selected pattern.

With respect to claim 48, note that Martin teaches the use of a drive roll 28 for feeding the web 27 out of the slot (Martin, Fig.1); and Schoendienst et al. (Fig.1f) teaches the conventional use of a motor (M) within the cabinet for advancing the web out of the media cartridge (SR) via a take-up spindle 110 and the motor (M) .

Claims 2 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. as applied to claims 1,3, 6-10, 12,

17, 21-33, 37, 38-45, 48 and 49 above, and further in view of Sandhoo (DE 29908649-U1)).

Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. teach the printer for producing rolls of wallpaper having substantially the structure as recited. See the explanation of Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. above. Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. do not teach the dryer located between the printhead and the winding area for drying the printed medium. Sandhoo teaches the conventional dryer (no numeral reference) located between the printing area 4 and the winding area 6 for drying the printed web 8. In view of the teaching of Sandhoo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printer of Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. by providing the dryer as taught by Sandhoo for quickly drying of a printed web.

Claims 4, 35 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. as applied to claims 1,3, 6-10, 12, 17, 21-33, 37, 38-45, 48 and 49 above, and further in view Kwasny et al. (US 2002/0118990).

Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. teach the printer for producing rolls of wallpaper having substantially the structure as recited. See the explanation of Martin,Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. above. Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. do not teach the slitting mechanism for slitting a media web. Kwasny et al. teaches the cutter mechanism 14 which cuts transversely media web 18 and slitting mechanism 16 which slices longitudinally the media web as shown in Fig.2.

In view of the teaching of Kwasny et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printer of Martin and Sharma et al. by providing the slitting mechanism as taught by view Kwasny et al. to improve the efficiency of cutting a web into multiple narrow webs after printing.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. as applied to claims 1,3, 6-10, 12, 17, 21-33, 37, 38-45, 48 and 49 above, and further in view of Lem et al. (US 2003/0116747).

Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. teach the printer for producing rolls of wallpaper having substantially the structure as recited. See the explanation of Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. above. Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. do not teach the bar code scanner which communicates with the processor. Lem et al. teaches the conventional use of a bar code scanner 230 to input data to a processor 240. In view of the teaching of Lem et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printer of Martin and Sharma et al. by providing the bar code scanner as taught by Lem et al. for ease and quickly entering data to the processor.

Claims 11-15, 17 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. as applied to claims 1,3, 6-10, 12, 17, 21-33, 37, 38-45, 48 and 49 above, and further in view of Mizoguchi et al. (US JP 2000-248217).

Martin, Sharma et al. and Schoendienst et al. teach all that is claimed, except a rail on which the print head slides into and out of a printing position. Mizoguchi et al.

teaches the print head 1100 which slides into and out a printing position as shown in Fig.2 of Mizoguchi et al., In view of the teaching of Mizoguchi et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printer of Martin and Sharma et al. by providing the rail as taught by Mizoguchi et al. for quickly mounting the print head to a printer. With respect to claim 17, the use of preheat platen is well known in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed on September 30, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive in view of the new ground(s) of rejections.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2169.

The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld, can be reached on (571) 272-2168.

The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Anthony Nguyen
11/29/05
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800